Criteria wise Evaluation Guidelines and Document Verification during NBA team visit
(Tier – II Institution)

Dr. Jagada Nand Jha

Principal

MIT Muzaffarpur

Email: jagadanand@gmail.com

Criteria wise Marks

Criteria No.	Criteria	Tier – I Marks	Tier-II Marks
	Programme Level Criteria		
1	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50	60
2	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100	120
3	Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes	175	120
4	Students' Performance	100	150
5	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	200
6	Facilities and Technical Support	80	80
7	Continuous Improvement	75	50
	Institute Level Criteria		
8	First Year Academics	50	50
9	Student Support Systems	50	50
10	Governance, Institutional Support, and Financial Resources	120	120
	Total	1000	1000

Weightages to Sub-Criteria of C3

	NBA Criterion	TIER 1 Marks	TIER 2 Marks
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	175	120
3.1	Correlation between COs and POs-PSOs	25	20
3.2	Attainment of COs	75	50
3.3	Attainment of POs and PSOs	75	50

Evaluation Guidelines for 3.1

Tier II

3.1.1 Evidence of COs being defined for every course (5)

3.1.2 Explanation of CO-PO/PSO tables to be ascertained (5)

3.1.3 Explanation of program level Course-PO/PSO tables to be ascertained (10)

3.1.1. **Course Outcomes** (5)

Guideline: Evidence of COs being defined for every course

- While COs of three courses from 2nd, 3rd and final year of study need to be included in the SAR, COs for all the courses need to be prepared by the Department.

- The Department should make available COs of any course as demanded by the visiting committee.

Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:

- Appropriateness of the statements shall be seen for at least one course each from 2nd, 3rd and final year of study Subjective evaluation by the visiting team.

SC 3.1.2 - Tier II

3.1.2. CO-PO/PSOs matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (six matrices) (5)

Guidelines

- A. Explanation of table to be ascertained

Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:

- Mapping to be verified for at least two matrices

Subjective evaluation by the visiting team.

Criterion 3.1.3 – Tier II

3.1.3 Program level Course-PO/PSOs matrix of ALL courses including first year courses

Guidelines:

A. Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)

Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:

A. Mapping to be verified for at least one course per year of study; program outcomes and program specific outcomes getting mapped with the core courses are also to be verified

Subjective evaluation by the visiting team.

Sub-Criterion3.2: Attainment of Course Outcomes

3.2.1 Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcome is based (10)

3.2.2 Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels (40)

3.2.1 Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of

Course Outcome is based

Guidelines

A. List of assessment processes (2)

B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (8)

Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:

A. & B. Evidence for appropriate assessment processes including data collection, verification, analysis, decision making

Sub-Criterion 3.2.2:Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels

Sub-Criterion - 3.2.2 Guidelines

A. Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses.

- Computation of attainment levels of COs of all courses as per the stated assessment processes.

- Computation of attainment gaps of all COs of all courses.

- Plan for closing the attainment gaps or enhancing the targets with explanations.

Sub-Criterion 3.2.2 - Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed

A. Methodology to define set levels and its compliance; data collection, verification, analysis and decision making; details for one course per year of study to be verified

- The visiting committee will assess, with regard to data collection, verification, analysis and decision making, one course per year of the program as per the process defined by the Department and awards marks out of 40 for Tier II institution and out of 65 for Tier I institution.

Sub-Criterion 3.3:Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes

3.3.1 Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the attainment of each of the Pos & PSOs (10)

3.3.2 Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO (40)

Sub-Criterion 3.3.1

A. List of assessment tools & processes (5)

B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (5)

Sub-Criterion 3.3.1 – Guidelines

A. List of assessment tools & processes (5)

Assessment Tools (periodicity)

- Attainment of COs

- Surveys

- Results of evaluation of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities using rubrics

Assessment Processes

- Method for identifying the POs and PSOs addressed by COs of a course

- Method of determining the strength to which a PO/PSO is addressed by a course

- Method of setting the targets for POs and PSOs

- Percentage weightage to Indirect Assessment of POs/PSOs

- Method of computing PO/PSO attainment

- Plan for reducing the PO/PSO attainment gaps and for enhancement of targets where necessary.

Sub-Criterion 3.3.1....Contd.

B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (5)

- Explanation of the choice of PO/PSO assessment processes in terms of their relevance.

- Explanation of why the Department considers the tools chosen determine the quality of PO/PSO assessment.

- Illustration with an example

The choice of processes should be common across all the Departments of an Institution

Sub-Criterion 3.3.1 – Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed

A. & B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for POs & PSOs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also at least two POs & two PSOs attainment levels shall be verified

The visiting committee will verify the computation of attainment of two POs and PSOs as per the processes chosen by the Department

Sub-Criterion 3.3.2 Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO

Guidelines

A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO/PSO (24)

Documents that would be verified by the visiting committee

- Method of computing attainment of POs and PSOs.

- Attainment of PO/PSOs by each course/core activity.

- Computing the level of attainment of POs and PSOs at the program level for two batches.

B. Overall levels of attainment

- Analysis of overall levels of attainments of POs and PSOs need to be prepared by the Department.

- If the year-on-year attainments are reducing the Department should be able to explain well (The decrease in the quality of students should never be used as a reason!)

Sub-Criterion 3.3.2 – Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed

A. & B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for POs & PSOs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also at least two POs & two PSOs attainment levels shall be verified.

- Visiting committee will inspect all the documentation related to computation of attainment of POs and PSOs.

- The committee will verify the calculations related to computation of two selected POs and two PSOs.

All the sources used for presentation are duly acknowledged

Thanks